FILED David S. Toy, Esq. 1 2012 JUN 25 PM 1:59 Email: davidstoyesq@gmail.com 2 CA SBN 168368 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES Gilman & Allison LLP Sunrise Lake Center 3 9307 Broadway, Suite 407 Pearland, TX 77584 Telephone: 888 225 5767 Facsimile: 866 543 3643 Attorneys for Plaintiffs, 4 5 Patricia Sandoval and Nicholas Taliaferro 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Case GV 12-5517 PATRICIA SANDOVAL, an 11 individual, and NICHOLAS TALIAFERRO, an individual, 12 Plaintiffs, 13 14 VS. **COMPLAINT** CARNIVAL CORPORATION, a 15 Panamanian corporation, COSTA CROCIERE, SpA, an Italian public limited company, JOHN DOES 01 through 05, individuals, and JOHN DOE CORPORATIONS 06 through 16 17 18 10, corporations, Defendants. 19 20 Plaintiffs Patricia Sandoval and Nicholas Taliaferro ("Plaintiffs"), by and 21 through undersigned counsel, bring this action against Defendants identified below, 22 and plead as follows: 23 This Complaint states individual claims for products liability and negligence, 24 among other things, and is seeking damages in excess of the jurisdictional minimum 25 of this Court, exclusive of interest, costs, and attorneys' fees. 26 27

I. PARTIES

- 1.1 Plaintiffs are United States citizens and residents of the State of California.
- 1.2 Defendant Carnival Corporation is a Panamanian corporation, registered to do business in the state of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida, but which will do business in California as Carnival Cruise Lines ("Carnival"). Upon information and belief, and at all relevant times, Carnival controlled or at least heavily influenced the design of the MV *Costa Concordia* to suit its commercial needs as opposed to best or even good marine practices. Carnival may be served with process through its registered agent for service of process in California, C T Corporation, 818 W. Seventh Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017.
- 1.3 Defendant Costa Crociere SpA is an Italian public limited company, with its principal place of business in Genoa, Italy, and was at all relevant times the owner of the MV *Costa Concordia*. In accordance with the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (the "Hague Convention"), Plaintiffs hereby forward duplicate originals of process with this Complaint, translated into Italian, to the Central Authority for Italy, to wit: L'Ufficio unico degli ufficiali giudiziari presso la corte d'appello di Roma, Via Giulio Cesare 52, 00192 Rome, Italy, for service on Defendant Costa Crociere SpA ("Costa Crociere"), at its home office located at Piazza Piccapietra 48, 16121, Genoa, Italy.
- 1.4 Defendant John Does 01 through 05 are the fictitious name of the individuals, who upon information and belief, designed the layout of the MV *Costa Concordia*, including but not limited to the arrangement and configuration of the internal spaces such as restaurants and other public areas, as well as placement and arrangement of pools and other fixtures. Plaintiffs assert causes of action against Defendant John Does 01 through 05, and will amend this Complaint or seek leave to

amend as necessary to state the true names of Defendant John Does 01 through 05 when the identities of those individuals have been determined.

1.5 Defendant John Doe Corporations 06 through 10 are the fictitious names of the entity or entities which, upon information and belief, designed and built the MV *Costa Concordia*. Plaintiffs assert causes of action against Defendant John Doe Corporations 06 through 10, and will amend this Complaint or seek leave to amend as necessary to state the true names of Defendant John Doe Corporations 06 through 10 when the identities of those corporations have been determined.

II. JURISDICTION

- 2.1 This is an admiralty and maritime claim, within this Court's original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1333, and brought pursuant to the General Maritime Law of the United States, as supplemented by Italian law.
- 2.2 This Court has general jurisdiction over Carnival by virtue of its regular, continuous, and systematics contacts within the state of California, and its presence in the forum when served.
- 2.3 This Court has general jurisdiction over Costa Crociere by virtue of its regular, continuous, and systematic contacts within the State of California.
- 2.4 This Court has general jurisdiction over John Does 01 through 05, and Defendant John Doe Corporations 06 through 10, by virtue of, on information and belief, the regular, continuous, and systematic contacts within the state of California by the Does, and each of them.

III. VENUE

- 3.1 Venue is proper in this Court because Defendants and all Does are subject to jurisdiction in this District (hereafter, "Defendants" include all Does, unless otherwise specified.)
- 3.2 This forum is proper, and not subject to contractual limitation or forum requirements which are void, voidable, and/or unenforceable pursuant to Italian law.

IV. FACTS

- 4.1 The foregoing paragraphs are re-alleged as though fully again set forth.
- 4.2 On or about January 13, 2012, the MS *Costa Concordia* (the "Vessel"), carrying over 4,200 passengers and crew, struck a rock offshore Isola del Giglio, Grosseto, Italy.
- 4.3 In the chaos and terror that followed, at least 32 people lost their lives, and hundreds more were injured, including Plaintiffs.
- 4.4 This tragic allision in part resulted from a ridiculous stunt perpetrated by the so-called captain of the Vessel, in an ill-conceived attempt to "salute" the inhabitants of Isola del Giglio, or "honor" past and present crew members who lived on the island, and the failure of Costa Crociere and/or Carnival to implement a proper safety management system.
- 4.5 Instead of a salute, it was an obscene and deadly gesture; instead of honor, it was shame. The grounding of the Vessel was a tragedy, but the Vessel's design and plan for passenger safety and evacuation was a travesty, leading to loss of life for some, and pain, suffering and ongoing trauma for hundreds, including Plaintiffs.
- 4.6 The Vessel was designed and built by Does 06 through 10, under the direction and control of Carnival and/or Costa Crociere.
- 4.7 For Defendants, profits are more important than safety. They designed the Vessel to maximize passenger carrying capacity, but at the expense of seaworthiness, and passenger safety.
- 4.8 In addition to maximizing the number of passengers carried, the Vessel was also designed to be brought directly to dock, so that its many passengers would not need to be ferried from the Vessel to land.
- 4.9 To maximize passenger carrying capacity, the Vessel was designed with a very tall superstructure, the amount of hull above the waterline, and a very shallow draught, the amount of hull below the waterline.

- 4.10 The Vessel's shallow draught made it unstable, and susceptible to tilting during the allision with the rock, rendering many of its lifeboats useless for the intended purposes of saving lives and avoiding injury.
- 4.11 Comparisons between the Vessel and the RMS Titanic are valid and apt. Both were very large by the standards applicable at the time. As with the Titanic, the Vessel was designed to be Europe's largest cruise ship ever. Both were considered safe (and in fact the RMS *Titanic* was considered "unsinkable.") But, both suffered from design flaws that led to their tragic sinkings, injuries and death.
- 4.12 When the Vessel hit the rock, it opened up a large gash on the port side, flooding at least three of the Vessel's seven so-called watertight compartments. Despite its great size, the Defendants followed a dated and outmoded standard which required the Vessel remain afloat only if two of its watertight compartments flooded. Like the RMS *Titanic*, with its watertight compartments flooded, the Vessel was doomed, as were its passengers, guests and crew.
- 4.13 Once its watertight compartments flooded, the Vessel began to list to port, or tilt to the side. Because of the extreme list and its great 13-deck height, and because the Captain delayed in giving the evacuation order, the lifeboats on the starboard side of the vessel could no longer be launched.
- 4.14 The sheer scale of the Vessel and its passenger areas, designed to accommodate up to 3,780 passengers and more than 1,000 crew, created evacuation challenges not planned for or addressed by Defendants. Unlike the RMS *Titanic*, the evacuation routes on the Vessel confused many passengers, with the result no quick or easy evacuation could be performed.
- 4.15 In this emergency, the internal architecture of the Vessel turned into a deadly maze and labyrinth, so complex there was no way to plan for or organize a safe and efficient evacuation plan. This complex design and architecture, coupled with inept or absent leadership, led to the chaos and confusion causing the injuries and deaths suffered by the Vessel's passengers and crew, including Plaintiffs.

- 1
 2
 3
 4

- 28 //

- 4.16 Defendants ultimately were responsible for the design of the Vessel, and ensuring her crew could implement safety programs designed to work with a Vessel of this size and complexity, to evacuate the passengers of the Vessel safely, and without injury or loss of life.
- 4.17 Defendants failed to fulfill responsibilities under governing laws and regulations. As a result, some people died and many people were injured.
- 4.18 Defendants are being sued for their strict liability, independent acts of wrongdoing, breaches of duty and negligent acts, all of which caused and contributed to this tragedy, the loss of life by some, and the injuries of hundreds more, including Plaintiffs.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

- 5.1 The foregoing paragraphs are re-alleged as though fully again set forth.
- 5.2 Plaintiffs' injuries were caused by the Vessel, a defective product designed, manufactured and sold by Defendants, who were engaged in the business of placing products, like and including the Vessel, into the stream of commerce, and in fact charging passengers to ride aboard the defective product.
- 5.3 The Vessel was defective, and reached Plaintiffs without substantial change from its condition at the time it was originally sold. These defects rendered the Vessel unreasonably dangerous, which was the producing cause of injury to Plaintiffs, and for which Defendants are strictly liable.
- 5.4 Defendants knew, or should have known, of the risk of harm to Plaintiffs by allowing them to sail on the Vessel, but breached their duty to warn any of the passengers, including Plaintiffs, of the risks associated with sailing on the Vessel. This lack of adequate warning of the Vessel's many defects was the producing cause of injury to Plaintiffs.
- 5.5 Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiffs to keep them safe from harm while on and using the Vessel for its intended purpose.

//

//

- 5.6 Defendants breached that duty by failing to design the Vessel so that it would meet the minimum necessary safety factors in the target design environmental condition, *i.e.*, sailing the ocean, carrying passengers. Defendants further breached their duty to Plaintiffs by failing to warn users of this Vessel of the defective design and dangers posed while using the Vessel as intended.
- 5.7 Defendants Carnival and Costa Crociere were each separately liable for the negligent operation of the Vessel and for the training of its crew as well as for approving the inherently defective design of the Vessel.
- 5.8 As a result of Defendants' breaches of duty, Plaintiffs were injured, and suffered the damages here alleged.

VI. GROSS NEGLIGENCE

- 6.1 The condition of the Vessel encountered by Plaintiffs exposed them to extreme hazards. By designing the Vessel to maximize passenger carrying capacity, at the expense of seaworthiness, and by failing to design an interior that could be evacuated consistently in a safe manner, Defendants were on notice of multiple dangerous and deadly conditions onboard the Vessel. Nonetheless, Defendants failed to warn Plaintiffs of the defects in the Vessel, thus exposing Plaintiffs to the consequences of Defendants' actions.
- 6.2 Defendants proceeded with knowledge or conscious indifference that their failure to properly design the Vessel, and to warn passengers and crew of the dangers posed by the defective design, would result in injury and/or death to users of the Vessel, including Plaintiffs. Despite that knowledge, and the understanding a high likelihood existed that injury or death would result from their acts or failures to act, Defendants proceeded in disregard of their knowledge, and subjected Plaintiffs to the dangerous conditions which resulted from these acts and failures to act. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for gross negligence and punitive damages.

VII. DAMAGES

7.1 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, including negligence and breaches of duty for which they are strictly liable, Plaintiffs suffered the following injuries and resultant damages, including, but not limited to: (a) mental anguish in the past; (b) lost earnings; (c) physical pain and suffering; (d) conduct entitling them to punitive and moral damages; (e) all such other and further damages as allowed by law.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiffs pray that judgment be entered in their favor in the amount of at least \$10,000,000, and punitive damages as determined by the finder of fact in this case, as against the Defendants, representing their actual damages in an amount exceeding the jurisdictional limits of this Court, together with prejudgment and postjudgment interest, excluding from this sum any amounts for their claim for punitive damages, which they leave to the discretion of this Court, guided by its conscience, attorney's fees, and costs of suit, and for all such other and further relief to which they may show themselves justly entitled, in law and equity.

DATED: June 25, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

GILMAN & ALLISON LLP

/s/ David S. Toy

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Patricia Sandoval and Nicholas Taliaferro

	Case 2:12-cv-05517-FMO-SH Docume	nt 1	Filed 06/25/12	Page 9 of 14	Page ID #:11
1	OF COUNSEL:				
2	GILMAN & ALLISON LLP				
3					
4	Sunrice Lake Center				
5	9307 Broadway, Suite 407 Pearland, TX 77584 Email: dgilman@gilmanallison.com Email: ballison@gilmanallison.com				
6	Email: <u>ballison(a)gilmanallison.com</u>				
7	EAVES LAW FIRM				
8	101 North State Street				
9	John Arthur Eaves, Jr. 101 North State Street Jackson, MS 39201-2811 Telephone: 601 355 7961 Email: johnjr@eaveslaw.com				
10) Email. joiniji(@cavesiaw.com				
11					
12					
13	3				
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
1920					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge George H. Wu and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Stephen J. Hillman.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV12- 5517 GW (SHx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
=======================================
NOTICE TO COUNSEL
copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is ed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	L	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 2:12-cv-05517-FMO-SH Document 1 F	iled 06/25/12 Page 11 of 14 Page ID #:13
Name & Address:	
David S. Toy	
Gilman & Allison LLP	
9307 Broadway, Suite 407	
Pearland, TX 77584	
•	
<u> </u>	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
PATRICIA SANDOVAL, an	CASE NUMBER
individual, and NICHOLAS	
TALIAFERRO, an individual,	
PLAINTIFF(S)	CV12-5517-GW(SXX)
V.	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
CARNIVAL CORPORATION, a Panamanian	
corporation; COSTA CROCIERE, SpA, an Italian	SUMMONS
public limited company; see additional page	SUMMONS
DEFENDANT(S).	
TO: DEFENDANT(S):	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
Within 21 days after service of this summon must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ☑ counterclaim ☐ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 1 or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Day 9307 Broadway, Suite 407 Pearland, TX 77584 judgment by default will be entered against you for the region of the pour answer or motion with the court.	2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer vid S. Toy, whose address is If you fail to do so,
	•
Dated: JUN 2 5 2012	Clerk, U.S. District Court By: Deputy Clerk
:	(Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	s agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed
CV-01A (10/11 / SUMM	MONS

Case 2:12-cv-05517-FMO-SH Document 1 Filed 06/25/12 Page 13 of 14 Page ID #:15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL COVER SHEET

		CIVIL CO					
	if you are representing yourself ☐ and NICHOLAS TALIAFERRO	3)	DEFENDANTS CARNIVAL CORPORATION; COSTA CROCIERE, SpA; John Does 01 through 05, individuals; and John Doe Corporations 06 through 10, corporations				
yourself, provide same.)	dress and Telephone Number. If your of Broadway, Suite 407, Pearland		Attorneys (If Known)				
4.45.40 9.45.40				emma n ni i a	<u> </u>		
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	(Place an X in one box only.)		NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PAR X in one box for plaintiff and		Only		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	₹ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of Thi		F DEF I Incorporated or P of Business in thi			
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citize of Parties in Item III)	nship Citizen of And	other State	2	Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 nother State		
		Citizen or Sub	ject of a Foreign Country	3 🗀 3 Foreign Nation	□6 □6		
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one	e box only.)		•				
Original Description Descripti							
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLA	AINT: JURY DEMAND: 🗆 Y	es Mo (Check 'Y	es' only if demanded in compl	aint.)			
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.	.P. 23: □ Yes ANo	C	MONEY DEMANDED IN	COMPLAINT: \$ 10,000,0	00		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite	the U.S. Civil Statute under whic	h you are filing and v	vrite a brief statement of cause.	Do not cite jurisdictional sta	atutes unless diversity.)		
28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and	d 1333; Product Liability Personal	Injury					
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	e an X in one box only.)						
	CONTRACT □ 110 Insurance	TORTS PERSONAL INJU	**************************************	PRISONER PETITIONS	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards		
		☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Proc	PROPERTY □ 370 Other Fraud	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt.		
	☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	□ 371 Truth in Lendir	1	Relations		
	☐ 150 Recovery of	☐ 320 Assault, Libe Slander		□ 530 General	□ 730 Labor/Mgmt.		
☐ 460 Deportation☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced	Overpayment & Enforcement of	□ 330 Fed. Employe	Property Dama		Reporting & Disclosure Act		
and Corrupt	Judgment	Liability	Product Liability		☐ 740 Railway Labor Act		
Organizations	☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 340 Marine ■ 345 Marine Produ	BANKRUPTCY	☐ 550 Civil Rights	☐ 790 Other Labor		
	□ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	□ 422 Appear 28 USC		Litigation		
1490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.	☐ 350 Motor Vehicl	e 158	FORFEITURE / PENALTY	☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act		
□ 810 Selective Service□ 850 Securities/Commodities/	Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of	☐ 355 Motor Vehicl		☐ 610 Agriculture	PROPERTY RIGHTS		
Exchange	Overpayment of	Product Liabi ☐ 360 Other Persons	IIII CIVII DICUTE	☐ 620 Other Food &	□ 820 Copyrights		
☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12	Veteran's Benefits	Injury	□ 441 Voting	Drug	□ 830 Patent		
USC 3410	☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 362 Personal Inju	* ICD 440 TT/A	☐ 625 Drug Related	□ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY		
□ 890 Other Statutory Actions□ 891 Agricultural Act	☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product	Med Malprac ☐ 365 Personal Inju		Seizure of Property 21 USC	□ 861 HIA (1395ff)		
□ 892 Economic Stabilization	Liability	Product Liabi	' [']	881	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)		
Act	☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 368 Asbestos Pers	sonal 445 American with	□ 630 Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC/DIWW		
□ 893 Environmental Matters	REAL PROPERTY	Injury Produc		☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	(405(g))		
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act	☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	Liability IMMIGRATION	Employment ☐ 446 American with	☐ 650 Airline Regs ☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))		
☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-	☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment			Safety /Health	FEDERAL TAX SUITS		
nation Under Equal	□ 240 Torts to Land	Application	Other	□ 690 Other	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff		
Access to Justice	☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	463 Habeas Corps			or Defendant)		
□ 950 Constitutionality of	☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Alien Detaine ☐ 465 Other Immig	Nigitis		☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609		
State Statutes		Actions			030 7009		
-							

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71 COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 1 of 2 CV-71 (05/08)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

If yes, list case number(s):	s this action been pi	viously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded of closed? We No Yes		
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Hav If yes, list case number(s):	e any cases been pre	viously filed in this court that are related to the present case? 🗹 No 🗆 Yes		
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case: (Check all boxes that apply) A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.				
(a) List the County in this District;	California County of	on, use an additional sheet if necessary.) utside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.		
County in this District:*	ts agencies or emple	yees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).	_	
County in this District.		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country San Diego; San Diego		
(b) List the County in this District; ☐ Check here if the government, i	California County of ts agencies or emplo	atside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. yees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).		
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
		Miami-Dade County, FL; Italy		
(c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation c		atside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. n of the tract of land involved.		
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
		Italy		
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us		ntura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties tract of land involved		
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER): /S	David S. Toy Date June 25, 2012		
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law but is used by the Clerk of the C	ne CV-71 (JS-44) C w. This form, approve	vil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ed by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)		
Key to Statistical codes relating to So	ocial Security Cases			
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action		
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))		
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)		
863	DIWC All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))			
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.		

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42

865

RSI

U.S.C. (g))